THE COURTS.

A Further Hearing in the Pacific Mail Suit Against King.

Ex-Treasurer Baxter and Director Talcott on the Stand.

The Order of Arrest Against Duncan, Sherman & Co.

Excluding Colored People from Places of Amusement.

ANOTHER ROSE MICHEL INJUNCTION.

The proceedings in the suit of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company against William S. King were resumed yesterday before Mr. Edwin M. Wight, as commissioner, at his office in the Drexel building, Messrs. Henry S. Bennett and John M. Goodwin acting as respective counsel for plaintiffs and defendant.

The first witness called was General Henry H. Baxter, ex-treasurer of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company. He testified that he did business at No. 19 Broad street; that he was director of the Pacific Mail Company in 1871; that he went South in the fall of that year, and that he sent in his resignation in 1872; he could not tell exactly the date on which it took effect; he was a member of the Executive Committee in 1872; this committee transacted the business of the company in the absence of the Board; they also met once a week and transacted such business as came before them; there was no especial power conferred on members of the Executive Committee. In response to a question as to their power to perform special duties, such as influencing special legislation, the witness said that he knew of no power conferred upon them which was not conferred on every director.

Mr. Bennett—Did you know why Mr. Abercrombie, who had been treasurer of the company, resigned?

Mr. Baxter—No, sir.

Mr. Bennett—Did you not hear that it was because he was requested to resign on account of a check which he refused to sign, Mr. Abercrombie thinking it would be in violation of his duty to sign it?

Mr. Baxter—I do not remember anything of the kind.

Mr. Bennett—Did not the Board of Directors pass special resolutions in regard to it?

Mr. Baxter—I do not remember.

Mr. Baxter, in the continuation of his evidence, testified that he was not present at a meeting of the Board on April 17, 1872, when the appointment of Henry Smith as treasurer was entered on the minutes. At that time Mr. Stockwell was president of the Board of Directors. He remembered that efforts were made to obtain a subsidy at Washington.

Mr. Bennett—Who was employed to protect the interest of the company at Washington?

Mr. Baxter—I do not know of my own knowledge who was, but I heard that Mr. Irwin, one of the San Francisco agents, was attending to the matter.

Mr. Bennett—Were you not at this time interested with Mr. Stockwell in some joint transactions in Pacific Mail stock?

Mr. Baxter—I don't remember that I was.

Mr. Bennett—Did you not about this time settle the suit of Challis against the Pacific Mail Steamship Company or deliver the papers forming the consideration for the settlement?

Mr. Baxter—I knew of the suit, but did not settle it nor deliver any papers in connection with it; I met Judge Fullerton and Challis and other lawyers at the request of Judge Nelson.

Mr. Bennett—Was it not settled by the delivery of "puts" on several thousand shares of the stock?

Mr. Baxter—I do not know that it was; he was not acquainted with John G. Schumaker; Mr. Stockwell was at the Fifth Avenue Hotel when he went there to see Challis, with Judge Nelson; he did not know that the Challis suit was settled in consequence of threatened developments in relation to money expended in Washington; he never heard of a telegram from Mr. Irwin to A. B. Stockwell telling him that that suit must be settled or the subsidy would never be granted; Mr. Stockwell and he did not constantly advise together in relation to the suit; he did not know how much the settlement had cost the company, and had never made it his business to inquire into the matter.

At the conference which took place at the Fifth Avenue Hotel, when endeavors were made to settle the suit, Mr. Baxter said he was not permitted to be present.

Mr. Goodwin—Was not the entire management and control of the company given over to Mr. Stockwell while he was President by the directors? In fact, he was the whole company?

Mr. Baxter—Yes, emphatically so.

Frederick A. Talcott, another of the directors of the company, was next called. He was asked as to a meeting held on November 28, 1874, the proceedings of which were kept secret. He said that before leaving the room the directors agreed to have nothing to say in regard to the meeting.

Mr. Bennett asked him if he heard any charges of corruption in relation to Mr. Stockwell made at that meeting, and if a portion of the records had been expunged.

Mr. Talcott said that he could not answer the question in justice to himself, as it would not be honorable for him to do so.

Some discussion ensued between counsel and witness, which ended in the latter refusing to answer. The decision of the Commissioner in regard to the question was that it was a proper one, and that the Court would protect Mr. Talcott in his refusal.

Mr. Talcott said that if he was forced to answer he would do so.

Mr. Bennett then asked for an adjournment, that he might consult with his client on forcing the question, and further hearing was adjourned till to-day at half-past ten.

DUNCAN, SHERMAN & CO.

Another motion to vacate the order of arrest against Duncan, Sherman & Co. was argued yesterday before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Chambers, in the suit of Washington A. Roebling and others against the company. An order of arrest was originally granted by Judge Lawrence in this action against the defendants. They were arrested on the 6th of October last and gave bail. The defendants then moved on the 17th of October last, before the same judge, on voluminous papers, to vacate such order. After argument and submission, Judge Lawrence in December last denied the defendants' motion, with costs, thus maintaining the order of arrest and delivering an elaborate opinion. After the order had been entered denying the motion as related, defendants moved for leave to renew, which was granted. In the meantime judgment had been entered. The defendants served new affidavits, and, upon the motion coming on last week, Mr. Henry H. Morange, counsel for plaintiffs, raised the preliminary objections that the motion could not be made after entry of judgment where the arrest had been made twenty days before judgment. The Court held that the point was well taken, but opened the judgment so as to enable the motion to be heard, and the motion was accordingly yesterday argued on its merits. Mr. Larocque, counsel for defendants, read affidavits to the effect that the banking house had never belonged to the firm as at present constituted, but to the former firm of Duncan, Sherman & Co., and that William B. Duncan owned but a one-third interest therein; that the deeds to Alexander Duncan in 1868 were made in good faith, and that the defendants cannot be held responsible for the failure not to record; that the defendants had large deposits in the Union Bank of London at the time they sold the exchange to plaintiffs, and that if the bank did not pay the draft it was not their fault. Mr. Morange, on the plaintiffs' behalf, read affidavits showing that in January, 1875, the defendant Duncan had sworn before the Commissioners of Taxes that the property Nos. 9 and 11 Nassau street was his own, and claimed a deduction of $60,000, which was accorded him; that the deed to the Lyceum had been executed in blank, and Alexander Duncan's name inserted just before the record, in July, 1875, and the same allegations were made in reference to the assignment of certain mortgages; that the defendants failed to produce any corroborating affidavits, papers or letters from the Union Bank of London, although three months had elapsed since the arrest of defendant; that the papers of defendant showed no satisfactory data as to where they were to obtain, the relief so much sought for; that even if they had obtained a loan it would have been but plunging themselves deeper into an abyss of insolvency which had long existed. The respective counsel supported their respective positions at great length, Mr. Morange expressing the conviction that the name of Duncan, Sherman & Co. could exert so potent spell in our courts, and that to vacate the order would be not only a dangerous precedent but would diminish the respect which the community entertained for the courts of justice.

Mr. Larocque made in the course of his concluding argument a strong point of the fact that when Duncan, Sherman & Co. closed the doors of their banking house their credit was unlimited; that their standing in financial circles was as firm and unshaken as granite; that the only object of suspending payments at the time they did was to save everything to their creditors, it being ascertained that, owing to the great shrinkage in values, there was a possibility that they would not be able to meet their liabilities, and that with a view to save their creditors to the furthest extent in their power each member of the firm gave up all he possessed, even to his personal property.

After hearing the argument, which was substantially the same as on the original motion, Judge Barrett took the papers, reserving his decision.

TESTING THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL.

In the United States Circuit Court yesterday a suit was commenced by Augustus D. Leighton against Messrs. Birch, Wambold & Backus, proprietors of the San Francisco Minstrels, under the Civil Rights law, for refusing him admittance to their theatre, and demands $500 damages under that act. Mr. Leighton is a very respectable colored gentleman, and had purchased two seats for the evening's entertainment on December 30, 1875, and invited a lady to accompany him. On presenting the tickets to the doorkeeper it is alleged that he was refused admission, his tickets were taken from him, his money returned and then with his lady he was turned into the street. Deeming injustice done him he seeks to avail himself of the Civil Rights bill, passed last March by Congress. This being the first civil suit commenced in this district under the Civil Rights law Messrs. Pullman & Sexton, attorneys for Leighton, having abundant support, intend to make a test case of it, and, if necessary, carry it to the Supreme Court of the United States.

ROSE MICHEL AGAIN IN COURT.

In the Superior Court, Special Term, before Judge Sanford, Messrs. Shook and Palmer, proprietors of the Union Square Theatre, applied yesterday through their counsel, Judge Dittenhoefer, for an injunction against Francis S. Street and Francis S. Smith, to restrain them from publishing the story of Rose Michel in the *New York Weekly*, of which they are proprietors. The papers on which the application was based allege that Shook & Palmer purchased the original manuscript of the play, both in French and English, from Ernest Blum, of Paris, the author, for a large sum; that they are the owners of the copyright of the play; that their right and ownership in the play was affirmed by Judge Curtis of the Superior Court, in the action by the same plaintiffs against Mr. Augustin Daly, of the Fifth Avenue Theatre, after an elaborate argument. A temporary injunction was granted, with an order to show cause why the same should not be made permanent. The order was made returnable at eleven o'clock A. M. on next Tuesday, when the matter will come up for argument.

SUMMARY OF LAW CASES.

The government brought suit yesterday, in the United States District Court, against the New York Rectifying Company, to recover $1,000, alleged as due for taxes and penalties.

Writs of error were granted yesterday by Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Chambers, in the case of Thomas Carpenter, convicted of burglary, and Bahi Jacobosky, convicted of keeping a disorderly house. Both cases will be taken to the Supreme Court, General Term, for review.

The various proprietors of different theatrical places in the city where wines and liquors are sold, on which the police recently made descents, have decided to test in the courts the legality of such police interference with their business. Ex-Judge Curtis, whose successful defence in the Tivoli Theatre case is still fresh in the public memory, has been retained as counsel, and will bring the matter to speedy trial.

Pierre Le Brony, chief steward, and Edward Seorano, barkeeper, both employed upon the steamship Pereire, of the Transatlantic line, were arrested yesterday, the former upon a charge of smuggling and the latter for attempted smuggling. They were brought before United States Commissioner Shields and held in $500 bail each for further examination. Le Brony was seen to leave the ship by the Custom House officer on the dock under rather suspicious circumstances, and, refusing to be searched, it was forcibly done, and a number of toy balloons taken from him. He was then placed in the charge of a police officer.

Some time since, in the suit of Randell against Dusenberry, trustee, under an assignment from one Cecall Byler, a judgment was obtained by the plaintiff for $3,410, with directions that the same be paid in preference to all other claims, out of a particular fund in the defendant's hands. On a failure to comply with this direction a motion was made before Judge Sanford, in the Superior Court, Special Term, to commit Mr. Dusenberry for contempt of Court. In his decision upon the motion, given yesterday, Judge Sanford holds that while the remedy by execution against property is available, he is of the opinion that neither justice nor the law would permit the incarceration of a judgment debtor under a non-bailable attachment as a means of enforcing payment of a judgment. He thinks the policy of our law is more lenient and humane.

In the suit of David Rosenberg against William Morris, Charles H. Smith appearing as attorney for plaintiff and David Levy for defendant, yesterday, before Judge McAdam at Marine Court, Chambers, queer circumstances arose. Morris made oath that he has been in custody for want of $200 bail for a month past, that one Hegerman received $17 from him in the jail, promising to get him discharged from arrest, but that nothing had been done. Mr. C. H. Smith showed a notice of appearance from D. A. Levien, Jr., as attorney for Morris, and argued that Mr. Levy could not be heard for the defendant as his attorney. The Court sustained the objection subject to hearing Mr. Levien and Hegerman, both of whom were ordered to show cause for the apparent contempt. Hegerman could not be found, and Mr. Levien attended and stated that he had never authorized the notice or use of his name, which he was sorry to say had been frequently employed by Hegerman heretofore without authority, and that he desired the assistance of the Court to put a stop to it. Judge McAdam accepted Mr. Levien's statement and discharged the rule against him, but continued it against Hegerman, for whom Mr. Levy will search, and then ordered that Mr. Levy be substituted as Morris' attorney. Mrs. Morris was in court and being examined on oath by the Court testified that she and her two children were in an impoverished condition, wholly dependant for support upon the exertions and earnings of Morris, who is a peddler by occupation. Upon that testimony and the consent of Mr. C. H. Smith, for the plaintiff, the Court made an order discharging Morris from arrest, but gave the plaintiff leave to prosecute his other civil remedies, to appoint a receiver and collect some outstanding accounts belonging to Morris.

DECISIONS.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS.

By Judge Barrett.

Matter of Bernhard.—Report confirmed and order granted.

The People, &c., vs. Lee.—Proof of service wanting.

Macauley vs. Diggles.—Defendant may interpose an answer upon payment of $79 60 costs within ten days, and upon within like time giving a bond in $500, with one surety, to pay any damages which plaintiff may recover herein.

Allyn vs. The Petroleum Fire Extinguisher Company.—Why was not the order to show cause served upon the President or other officer of the company? The amount of the assets not shown.

Tredway vs. Bresien.—Proof of service defective.

Stewart vs. Stewart.—Action continued and leave to file a supplemental complaint granted.

Maskell vs. Krause.—Defendant may interpose an answer within five days on payment within such five days of the costs as adjusted herein, and $10 costs of opposing this motion. Judgment, execution, levy and all proceedings to stand as security.

Garry vs. The Mayor, &c.—The $20 must be disallowed. Memorandum.

Lewis vs. Ross.—It seems to me that the plaintiff is entitled to an order vacating the stay of proceedings, with costs, and I do not understand why he asked an order denying the motion.

Kingston National Bank vs. Sharp.—Motion to require Hallahan to cancel judgment denied, with $10 costs.

Citizens' National Bank of Waterbury vs. Holmes.—Motion granted for first Friday of February.

Owens vs. Butler.—Defendant may interpose an answer properly verified by defendant and followed within five days on payment of $10 costs of opposing this motion.

Battin vs. McLanahan.—It would not be fair to receive defendant's affidavit. Motion granted, and defendant may serve his answer in two days on payment of $10 costs and stipulating to accept short notice of trial for February term, &c.

Wright vs. Underhill.—Motion denied with $10 costs. Memorandum.

Kingston National Bank vs. Sharp et al.—Motion for receiver granted. As to motion to punish for contempt, it is referred to George S. Sedgwick to take proof as to the alleged violation of the injunction and to report with his opinion, and if he shall report that the defendants are guilty of contempt charged, that he then report further what damages the plaintiffs' assignee has sustained and what compensation should be awarded to plaintiffs' assignee, &c.

SUPREME COURT—CIRCUIT—PART 1.

By Judge Van Vorst.

Higham vs. New York and Harlem Railroad Company et al.—Motion for new trial on minutes. Denied.

SUPREME COURT—SPECIAL TERM.

By Judge Van Vorst.

Pond's Extract Company vs. Humphreys' Specific Homœopathic Medicine Company.—Findings signed.

Kaliske vs. Horgan.—Findings signed. Opinion.

By Judge Donohue.

May vs. Kuhn et al.—Decree and findings signed.

Booth vs. Kitchen.—On demurrer conclusions of law are not proper to be signed except as an opinion.

Moran vs. McLarty.—Findings signed.

Smith vs. Reynolds.—Judgment for plaintiff. Opinion.

Frassioli vs. Jones.—Complaint dismissed with costs and extra allowance of $25.

Peetsch vs. The Mayor, &c.—Judgment for defendant on demurrer. Memorandum.

Cruft vs. Jessurrum.—Decree must be filled up.

SUPERIOR COURT—SPECIAL TERM.

By Judge Sanford.

Randall vs. Dusenbury, &c.—Motion denied, with $10 costs. Opinion.

By Judge Sedgwick.

Congregation Chebra Mikra Kodesh vs. Situs et al.—Order settled.

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS.

Before Judge Gildersleeve.

A NOTED FORGER ON TRIAL.

William J. Ree, indicted for forging the name of L. M. Bates & Co. to a note for $10,000, payable to the order of that firm at the Ninth National Bank in this city, was placed on trial before Judge Gildersleeve yesterday, the jury having been empanelled on the previous day. Assistant District Attorney Lyons opened the case for the people in a brief and pointed address, placing before the jury the facts he expected to prove in the course of the trial. The prisoner, he said, was indicted for forging one note of $10,000, dated February 5, 1875, purporting to have been made by L. M. Bates & Co., importers of silks and fancy goods in Broadway, drawn to their own order and payable three months after date at the Ninth National Bank in this city. But while this forgery alone was before them, he proposed to show that it was one of a series of six notes uttered at the same time and, with one exception, to the same party—Mr. George R. Hazewell, of No. 15 Broadway. On August 11, Mr. Lyons stated, the prisoner was arrested by Detective McDougall upon a charge of passing counterfeit bonds of the California and Oregon Railway Company, and that arrest led to his being arraigned on the present charge. At the same time George R. Hazewell and George Marshall were arrested, and in the possession of the former were found five notes—dated respectively February 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5—four being for $5,000 each and one for $10,000, all of the same tenor and bearing the same signature as the one mentioned in the indictment. Upon being arrested Mr. Hazewell stated that the notes had been brought to him on February 20 by Ree, who was accompanied by Marshall, and who represented that the notes had been intrusted to him for negotiation by a member of the firm of L. M. Bates & Co., who had been speculating in stocks, had lost money, and wanted to tide over the difficulty in this way. Ree further represented that the member in question did not want to have the notes exposed in open market. Mr. Hazewell seeming rather suspicious, Ree sat down and penned a certificate to the effect that the notes were genuine, and would be paid at maturity. Ree stated that he had obtained the notes from Mr. McCormack, a banker, at No. 48 Broad street, whereupon Mr. Hazewell proposed to call upon the gentleman, and did go to his office with Ree, but did not succeed in finding him. Mr. Hazewell not being yet satisfied, on February 26 Marshall brought to Hazewell a letter purporting to be signed by L. M. Bates & Co., and addressed to Mr. McCormack, setting forth the amounts of the various notes and the time when they became due, and declaring that they would be all paid at maturity. Some time after Ree sent to Mr. Hazewell asking for the certificate in order that McCormack might use it to negotiate another note of the same tenor for $20,000. In conclusion, Mr. Lyons said he would show in the course of the trial that the notes were negotiated for the benefit of Ree; that Marshall, who had advanced money on them, was to be repaid by Hazewell out of the money that the latter should raise upon the notes, and that Ree, who was indebted to Hazewell, was to discharge that indebtedness, and retain the balance. The defence, he said, would probably be that the notes did not purport to be signed by L. M. Bates & Co., but by L. McBates & Coe, there being on the signatures which were palpably imitations of the name of the former firm a slight flourish or two resembling a "c" after the letter M., and a stroke of the pen which might possibly be taken for an "e" at the end of "Co."

Levi M. Bates and Henry R. McDougall, members of the firm, whose name was forged, testified that the notes in question had not been made or signed by either of them, and George Marshall, called for the people, testified to his share in the negotiations, corroborating the statements made by Mr. Lyons in his opening.

The trial will be continued this morning.

FIFTY-SEVENTH STREET COURT.

Before Judge Murray.

HONESTY THE BEST POLICY.

The American Express Company lost on the 8th of January last five boxes of kid gloves, valued at $70, from one of its wagons. The gloves were found in Madison avenue by James Ryan, of No. 223 East Seventy-fourth street, and another man. Ryan took two of the boxes and the other man three. Subsequently the other man returned his three boxes on learning how they had been lost, and gave to the company Ryan's address and name. Mr. Charles L. Gowdey, the company's superintendent, called upon Ryan and received the latter's promise to return his share of the gloves as soon as he could get them back from those to whom he had given them—not sold them. Failing to keep his promise Ryan was arrested yesterday on a warrant, and was held for trial in default of $1,000 bail.

THE FIRST AVENUE CHAIN GANG.

John Murphy, Thomas Corrigan, Thomas Hanlon, James Daley, Thomas Corcoran, Thomas Markey, Caleb Cook and Peter Bowers, all boys of the worst class and under the age of sixteen years, were arraigned by Officer Kindelon and others, of the Twenty-first precinct. The arrest of the accused was the result of a raid made yesterday by Captain Murphy at the urgent request of the business people of First avenue, in the neighborhood of Thirty-eighth street, who have been suffering from the depredations of the boys for several months. The police found it impossible, while in uniform, to catch the offenders in their unlawful acts. The raid was, therefore, made in citizens' dress and proved very successful. Complaints of larceny were taken against them from two citizens and they were all held for trial, except Hanlon, who proved that he was not a member of the gang. A very respectable looking man named Thomas Timmons, who refused to give his residence, was taken in hand by members of the gang yesterday afternoon and was given a drugged pipe to smoke. He was already under the influence of liquor and smoked but a minute when he became insensible. He could not identify any of the gang, however, and he was held on a charge of intoxication.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS—Held by Judge Barrett.—Nos. 80, 91, 98, 228, 237, 277, 280, 285, 300, 310, 312, 316.

SUPREME COURT—SPECIAL TERM—Held by Judge Donohue.—Nos. 232, 285, 286, 287, 288.

COMMON PLEAS—EQUITY TERM—Held by Judge Joseph F. Daly.—Nos. 6, 1.

COMMON PLEAS—TRIAL TERM—Part 1—Held by Judge Van Hoesen.—Case on, No. 573.

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS—Held by Judge Gildersleeve.—Case on—The People vs. William J. Ree, forgery. No day calendar.

COURT OF APPEALS.

ALBANY, Feb. 1, 1876.

DECISIONS.

In the Court of Appeals to-day the following decisions were rendered:—

Judgment affirmed, without costs to either party as against the other in this court.—White's Bank of Buffalo vs. Nichols.

Judgment affirmed, with costs—Langley vs. Cornell; Morthorst vs. the New York Central and C. Railroad; Comins vs. the Board of Supervisors of Jefferson county; the Standard Oil Company vs. the Triumph Insurance Company; Weisner vs. the Village of Douglass; Lord vs. Thomas; Marsh vs. the Town of Little Valley.

Order reversed and judgment at the Circuit Court affirmed, with costs.—Arnold vs. Nichols.

Order affirmed, with costs.—The People ex rel. Tenth National Bank vs. The Board of Apportionment of New York city; Glenny vs. Stedwell.

Judgment affirmed.—Hamilton vs. The People.

Judgment reversed and new trial granted, costs to abide the event.—Brown vs. Volkenning.

MOTIONS.

Clearwater vs. Brill.—Motion for reargument. F. L. Westbrook for the motion, M. Schoonmaker opposed.

APPEALS FROM ORDERS.

No. 358. Lawrence Hennesy, appellant, vs. W. B. Cooper, respondent. Argued by C. C. Egan, of counsel for appellant, and by S. V. Lowell for respondent.

No. 361. Richard L. Hunter et al., executors, &c., appellants, vs. Isaac D. Westsell et al., respondents.—Argued by E. W. Paige, of counsel for appellants, and by D. Hand for respondents.

No. 362. Henry E. P. Sutton, appellant, vs. George P. M. Davis ex., &c., respondents.—Argued by A. G. Regnier, of counsel for appellant, and by Moses Ely for respondents.

No. 355. John A. Godfrey, appellant, vs. William Moser, respondent.—Argued by A. G. Regnier, of counsel for appellant, and by W. Fullerton for respondent.

GENERAL CALENDAR.

No. 46. The People, &c., vs. Wasson.—Argument resumed and concluded.

No. 93. Francis B. Wallace, appellant, vs. David Swinton, respondent.—Argued by S. W. Fullerton, of counsel for appellant, and by C. H. Winfield for respondent.

CALENDAR.

The following is the day calendar of the Court of Appeals for Wednesday, February 2:—Nos. 162, 126, 138, 161, 102, 164, 166, 146.

Adjourned.

THE POLICE COMMISSIONERS.

The full Board of Police Commissioners met yesterday, General Smith in the chair.

The President called the attention of the Board to the fact that counsel representing proprietors of concert saloons and variety theatres had waited upon him and protested against the enforcement of the law of 1862 prohibiting the selling of liquor in places of public amusement, on the ground that the same had been repealed by the law of 1872. In view of this he (General Smith) had thought it advisable to obtain the opinion of the counsel to the Board on the subject. That official being present was called upon, and gave it as his opinion that the law of 1862 relating to the matter was in full force at the present time.

On motion of Commissioner Wheeler, Colonel William May, clerk to the Committee on Rules and Discipline, was appointed secretary to the President at a salary of $1,500 per annum. P. C. Hubbell, one of the clerks in the Chief Clerk's office, was dismissed from the department. Patrolman Giffin, of the Fifth precinct, was also dismissed.

Commissioner Voorhis reported that $100 worth of property had been stolen from one of the scows of the Street Cleaning Department lying at Blackwell's Island on the night of the 26th ult.

An assistant janitor for the Central office was appointed at a salary of $600 per annum.

Permission was granted to several societies to hold masked balls.

A rule was adopted empowering the Superintendent to grant leaves of absence to members of the force in the absence of all the Commissioners.

Captain Killilea, of the Street Cleaning Department, was detailed to take charge of the police force assigned to the Hippodrome during the services of Moody and Sankey.

DISCIPLINING A POLICE CAPTAIN.

Captain Jeremiah Petty, of the First precinct, was before the Board of Police Commissioners yesterday, charged with violation of the rules in omitting to enter on the station house blotter the time at which he left the station house, as required by the regulations of the department. He admitted the charge, pleading that his failure was an unintentional oversight. Judgment was reserved.

THE FRENCH COOKS' BALL.

By a slight inadvertence the HERALD of yesterday morning stated that the ball of the Société Culinaire Philantropique was to take place last evening. This was a mistake, for the French cooks' ball will not take place until to-night, at Irving Hall.

NO SEAT NO FARE.

Effects of the Herald's Demand for Reform.

VIEWS OF CONDUCTORS AND DRIVERS.

Passengers Asserting Their Rights on the Cars.

THE DOOM OF OVERCROWDING.

In connection with the abuses in the management of the city railroad lines the views of the conductors and drivers engaged on the cars may be considered as possessing some interest and weight. A reporter of the HERALD, with the object of obtaining such, passed over several of the routes and entered into conversation with the employés mentioned. The substance of what passed between them is appended. As might be expected they had considerable to say relative to the discomforts of their vocation and of the insufficient compensation they receive for their services, but they also freely admitted that overcrowding was a gross abuse, and that the only remedy was the addition of more cars to the number now in service. It would appear that the conductors are indisposed, probably in accordance with instructions, to refuse transportation to passengers who object to pay fares when seats cannot be supplied; and that the plan of providing outside seats in the opinion of some would not work well in consequence of the great heat in summer and extreme cold in winter. Some citizens have already stood up for their legal rights and declined to pay because they were not able to obtain proper accommodation in the vehicles. This is a beginning in the right direction.

ON THE THIRD AVENUE LINE.

At a few minutes before six o'clock in the evening a Third avenue car going up town was taken at the corner of Canal street and the Bowery. All the seats were filled, and, in addition to the passage way which was choked with people who supported themselves by the overhanging straps, the platforms were fully occupied by passengers. The conductor was engaged in collecting fares as rapidly as possible in order to return to his lookout in the rear, so that he might gather in any others willing to undergo a thorough packing process. By the time the car reached the Cooper Institute he was rewarded by several more accessions to his load. He then seemed satisfied he had fully performed his duty. The bells and punches as well as himself were about to enjoy a rest. Some remarks were made by gentlemen outside as to the great inconvenience of travelling in such a distressing manner and as to the probability of rapid transit being at any time an accomplished fact. The public, it was observed, deserved better treatment, and it was very strange that the railroad companies did not consider that they were bound to furnish decent accommodation instead of the beastly manner in which passengers were now served on the horse cars. Their profits were very large, and, as they managed to avoid paying the licenses required by law, they could certainly afford to put on more cars and give seats to all who pay for them. The conductor, a young, intelligent and well-clad man, here interfered and remarked that persons in his position did not relish the system of overcrowding, for their duties would be much less onerous than they are at present if only the number of passengers the cars could seat were received. But their orders were to admit without limit so long as a standing spot could be found and the traveller could hold on by any possible part of the vehicle. The rules on the Third avenue line relative to conductors were, perhaps, more exacting than on any other in the city. Their pay, considering the number of hours they work, exposed to all kinds of weather, and the insecurity by which the tenure of their positions was held, was away down to the starvation point, and there was no earthly hopes of improvement or promotion, no matter how honest or faithful they may prove in the service. The newspapers, in taking up the cudgels for passengers, should not overlook

THE SUFFERINGS OF CONDUCTORS AND DRIVERS.

A gentleman here inquired if any instructions had been recently given relative to collecting fares from passengers who were not provided with seats. The conductor replied that the present discussion in the HERALD on this point was much canvassed at the depots and among street railroad men in general, but nothing in the nature of direct orders had been issued. However, he added, it was understood that if a passenger refused to pay fare when obliged to stand the course to pursue was to pass the matter by quietly and raise no fuss about it. This was, he believed, the course agreed upon by all the companies, for it was supposed that very few would decline handing over five cents when once on the cars going from or to their destination. The passengers well know the conductors had nothing to do with the matter, and that they were under a system of espionage, besides having to record, by a mechanical device, every penny received and also to account for the same. The passengers, and particularly the working classes, he said, submitted with less complaint to the inconveniences endured (though they are really the greatest sufferers) than those in easy and opulent circumstances. The latter frequently protest against being obliged to stand; speak of it as a public wrong that should not be tolerated and mutter things about legal proceedings, the abrogation of charters and the duty of the press. "Only last Friday a young man, when asked by me for his fare, declined paying on the ground that he should first get a seat, and as this was impossible, as all the seats were occupied, nothing further was said, and this stickler for his rights enjoyed a free ride from Twenty-third to Sixtieth street. The matter was mentioned at the depot and no notice was taken of it. It is no part of my contract with the company to force passengers from my car for refusing to pay if they are not accommodated as they claim the law requires and thus get myself in trouble. I do not know," said this employé of the Third Avenue Railroad, "what others intend to do. My place is not worth taking the consequences of an unjustifiable assault on a citizen."

ON THE SIXTH AVENUE LINE.

The Sixth avenue line receives a large share of public patronage, and investments in its stock are regarded as judicious. The writer entered one of its cars, which was crowded at the time. The hour was shortly after seven in the morning. Standing on the platform he managed to get into conversation with the driver, who seemed to have his attention divided between the horses before him and the folks on both sides of the street. Evidently he was looking out for people who desired to travel down town. Referring to the uncomfortable situation of the passengers, including women, who were standing up and who were pressed closely one against the other, he said there was no cure as far as he could understand for the matter. The public had eyes and could see when the cars were full. When any passenger got on and knew the seats were all occupied, why he could get off if he did not like to stand, and no one would prevent him from doing so. But if he determined to remain it was only right that he should pay for his ride. When it is suggested that the railroad companies had in a solemn manner entered into a contract to furnish seats for every passenger in reward for the privilege of using the public streets; that the other franchises bestowed on the other railroads were also of great value, and further that by putting on additional cars the abuse could be corrected, the driver was placed at his wits' ends for a suitable reply. He said, however, the companies were a hard lot, and treated men like himself as if they were irreclaimably dishonest. Their lives were full of hardships, and the public had little sympathy for them. He had no objection to the rule of "No seat no fare," and if it were made so binding that it could not be broken without severe penalties he would be glad of it. There was much talk about the Legislature interfering, but he thought the roads were too strong at Albany to allow any check to be put on the rich placers they were working. As to having seats overhead, that would not do at all in New York, where the climate is so cold in winter and so intensely hot in summer. "Think," said he, "of a dozen passengers seated on the roof in July or August, when the thermometer stood at ninety degrees or beyond that figure." "The thing," he repeated, "would not do. Hospitals for sunstruck cases would have to be erected along the routes of every line in the city under such circumstances. During certain portions of the winter months it would be impossible for people to remain exposed to the cold in such an elevated and unprotected position, and, again, when a rain storm prevailed, no one, no matter how hurried or anxious to pass from one part of the city to another, would be content to endure a thorough soaking. There is nothing left then, if every passenger is to be seated, but to supply more cars. This the companies will not do, if by hook or by crook they can avoid doing so. I told you at first passengers need not remain when they find they cannot get seats, but I must say that if once fares could not be collected unless seats were ready for their use you would soon see that more cars would be provided and the cause of complaint removed. The people themselves are most to blame if it is true that they are entitled to that accommodation. They have it in their power to bring the companies quickly to their senses. Good morning, sir."

ON THE DRY DOCK LINE.

Up Chatham street there is a full load on a Dry Dock and East Broadway car. The time is half-past five P. M. and the passengers are, as usual, most uncomfortably situated. Twenty-two are in seats and about the same number are standing inside and on the platforms. The conductor thus early on his trip has no idea that he has yet obtained his full complement and he peers sharply on each side of the street as the vehicle progresses for an addition to his human freight. His zeal does not go unrewarded. The sound of a bell stops the car from time to time and working people, anxious to reach home, are wedged into the interior or are permitted to take their chances, as to life and limb, outside. The collection of fares goes on, but not without grumbling from the sufferers. The conductor is seemingly patient and indifferent, but he comes across one individual who suggests that before paying fare he is entitled to a seat. Impossible. A discussion follows. It is urged on one side that to save trouble it would be better for the exacting and unreasonable individual to get off and wait for the next car or the one that would follow it and he might obtain what he wants. This is not acceptable, and the half dozen people on the platform seem to think that their fellow passenger is in the right. The conductor appeals to the sense of justice of the objector, who is cool and dignified in appearance, and remarks that the latter could hardly be mean enough to ride for nothing. This produces no effect, for the man, whether seriously or not, insists that he is first entitled to remain, and next, under the circumstances, not legally required to give money without the consideration the Dry Dock and East Broadway Company is bound to supply. The conductor moves away to another part of the car, but returns again after the lapse of five minutes. Meanwhile the standing passengers are elated with the ground taken in the case and encouraged the gentleman who refuses to pay to hold firm. They have read what has appeared in the HERALD, and claim that if violence is offered or an attempt to eject made, the company would be responsible for damages, and they would, they say, cheerfully come forward as witnesses to the transaction. They consider the overcrowding abominable, and that it is continued solely to promote avaricious ends. A test case is what is required. Either that or the Legislature to make it obligatory to have more cars run. The conductor asks again for the fare. The gentleman hands a card to him and at the same time pays his fare, remarking that he felt indisposed to suffer any further annoyance. The matter is now ended, much to the satisfaction of the conductor, who says that the gentleman might have been entirely correct in the course he had thought proper to pursue, but no part of his (the conductor's) instructions was to settle points of law; his duty was to collect fares from all passengers carried and to account for the money received. There were no words uttered during the progress of the incident that would lead to the inference that if the gentleman had persisted in not paying that he would have been obliged to leave the car.

ON THE BELT LINE.

The Belt line makes a circuit of that part of the city lying between Central Park and the Battery by way of South and West streets. It is one of the most important routes in the metropolis, and so far the Elevated road has interfered but slightly with its traffic. The cars in the early portion of the day are subject to many vexatious delays, owing to the great number of vehicles, laden with country produce, that remain stationary for many hours in the vicinity of Spring, Washington, Fulton and Catharine markets, and at other times the thoroughfares are almost rendered impassable by drays and wagons conveying merchandise to and from vessels at the piers. However, the Belt company's vehicles are run on time, and in one way or another they manage to fill the bill. The same overcrowding occurs on it and for the same reason as on other city roads. One of the conductors was interviewed by a HERALD reporter on Monday evening while going up town. Touching the subject of taking more passengers than could be seated the latter, whose object in engaging in the colloquy was not avowed or known, was informed that the abuse could not well be corrected, for people would insist in getting on, knowing that they would be obliged to stand during the whole or part of their journey. The conductors, having no orders to the contrary, interposed no objection, but on the other hand were rather pleased to make good returns at the depot. The companies considered that they possessed full right to carry as many as they could and to collect fare from them, and he was very sure they would fight hard before giving up the profitable privilege. If it was against the law, why did not some one before this time complain and have the matter settled? Or, if there was no law against the practice, why was not one made as there is in European countries? The whole business could be easily put at rest by giving orders to the conductors not to stop their cars while in motion, or permit passengers to get on when all the seats were occupied. There would be no trouble with the conductors, for they would strictly comply, having no interest in crowding the vehicles beyond what they can accommodate. As to carrying passengers outside at cheap rates he was afraid it would not work well. In the spring and fall the plan might answer, but in summer and winter no one could stand the exposure. Besides, the innovation would be of no service to women and children, who constitute a majority, if not more, of those who travel on street cars. They could not ascend or descend ladders, and men seated inside would hardly be willing to give up their places and go outside in order to oblige females. The conductor remarked to the reporter that he understood the Aldermen had power to take up and remove the rails in cases where their regulations were not complied with; but he had yet to learn that the city authorities had take any steps to prevent overcrowding. He had often commiserated the sufferings of young girls and infirm people while standing on the platforms, exposed to the biting blasts that came from the rivers, and even their miseries were not much greater than those standing inside, packed together like herrings in a barrel and inhaling a poisonous atmosphere. Concerning passengers who declined paying fares when seats for their accommodation were not available, the conductor had no instructions, but he was aware that the matter had been much spoken about. His duty was to collect, but he did not know what he would do on the spot if he was met with a refusal. Such had not yet happened to him during his experience on the Belt line. When a case did occur he would report it at the depot and get advice as to the course he should pursue if there were repetitions of the transaction. He did not care how the matter ended, as he was not in love with his employment; but of one thing he was very certain, that the system of overcrowding was attended by great hardships to the public, and in very many instances sensitive females must have their feelings grossly outragred.

RAPID TRANSIT THE ONLY REMEDY.

To THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

I saw a letter in the HERALD by William P. Webb, commission merchant. He says that of all the letters sent to the HERALD in regard to street cars none are to the point. He gives us one to the point by asking for (in substance) palace cars for all those willing to pay for them, and to have the lumbering cars, as he calls them, of the present used for those who cannot pay ten cents and are willing to take their chances for a seat. This is very good for Mr. Commission Merchant; but why should I, as well as all laboring men and women, be obliged to stand after a hard day's work or be packed in a poorly ventilated car because I cannot pay ten cents fare. We are having too much of this thing already. The poor man will soon be considered of no more account than the street car horses unless he refuses to be led by the nose by politicians. Politics is the ruination of the country. But to return to street cars. There is no remedy until we have rapid transit except give better ventilated and lighted street cars. It is impossible to run cars enough on the Third avenue road to give each person a seat. If a law is passed not allowing a conductor to collect fare unless a seat is given he will refuse to let any one unless there is a vacant seat. The streets will be full of passengers waiting, and they will be glad to take the old standing position. There are some lines that could run plenty of cars for the travel, and they should be made to do so. Rapid transit will relieve the street cars, so that all lines can furnish seats for all, and nothing else will in the opinion of A WORKINGMAN.

DOUBLE-DECKERS DEFENDED.

To THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

A correspondent in to-day's issue of the HERALD claims that no passengers would sit on the roof of cars save in summer. To this I reply that in Canada seats are provided on the roof. It is quite as agreeable to sit on the roof in cold weather as it is to stand on the front platform. The writer to whom I here refer states that none of your correspondents offers a remedy for the indefensible evils which all agree to exist. I was of opinion that I had incontestably shown in my communication, which appeared in last Thursday's HERALD, that I had successfully coped with the difficulties of the case in every direction. A gentleman, however, who proposes that steam power, with three cars attached to the engine, be used through crowded thoroughfares, is not likely to approve of other than a radical change. With this startling proposal carried into operation Mr. Bergh, in addition to his friends the quadrupeds, would be obliged to make a *protégé* of the human biped. F. M. B—W.

POLICEMEN'S SWEARING EXCELLED.

Russell Hamblin, an Englishman, sixty-five years of age, of No. 314 East Twenty-third street, was run over and killed about a quarter past six o'clock on the evening of January 22, in Third avenue, between Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth streets. At that time a young man named Albert Reilly was going up town on a Third avenue car, passing the wagon just as the man was run over and at a distance of only four feet from him. He distinctly read on the cart "Peter Dolger, brewer, Fifty-third street and First avenue." He followed up the cart and caused the driver's arrest. The driver's name was Lorenz Gugerich. He yesterday appeared before the Coroner's jury with two other drivers from the same brewery. They all swore they knew nothing about the accident. Notwithstanding the positive testimony of Reilly and another witness Gugerich was allowed to depart and the jury rendered a verdict of death by being run over by a wagon driven by some person unknown to them.

COMMISSIONERS OF EMIGRATION.

The Board of Commissioners of Emigration met at Castle Garden yesterday afternoon.

The most important communication submitted to the Board, was from the Collector of the City Revenue, that official stating if the taxes due the city were not promptly paid he would take summary proceedings to collect the same. This aroused much discussion in the Board, one member stating that the Commissioners could do nothing until April, when it was to be hoped the Legislature would relieve them from financial embarrassment. Another stated that it was yet to be determined what authority the city had over Castle Garden. It was finally decided that the Collector should be informed of the situation and asked to postpone action until the Legislature should move in the matter.

COLUMBIA LAW ASSOCIATION.

At a meeting of this society, to be held this evening in room 24, Cooper Union, a paper will be read upon "Insanity Considered as a Defence in Criminal Cases;" after which there will be a debate. Graduates of the Law School and friends of the society are invited to attend.

GERMAN IN THE SCHOOLS.

THE TEUTONIC TAXPAYERS ASK FOR REPRESENTATION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS WHERE THEIR CHILDREN HAVE A MAJORITY.

The German-American Taxpayers' Association of the Tenth, Eleventh and Seventeenth wards is one of the most powerful and influential organizations in New York; and as it is non-political, representing over $15,000,000 in real estate, and confining its interference solely to matters affecting German interests, the following communication, signed by 812 of its members, on the much agitated question of "Shall German Be Taught in the Public Schools?" will be read with interest. To-day the question on which it treats will be brought up for discussion in the Board of Education, and a large number of Germans will be present to see what action is taken by the Board in the matter. The principal point made in the argument for the Germanic side of the question is that they do not ask that the German language shall be forced upon schools where German scholars are in the minority, but only in schools where the children of Germans exceed in number those of other parentage than their own race:—

To THE HONORABLE BOARD OF EDUCATION:—

The undersigned members of the Taxpayers' Association of the Tenth, Eleventh and Seventeenth Wards of this city take the liberty to address your honorable Board on a subject which is not only of interest to every friend of education, but which particularly affects the inhabitants of that portion of New York which we represent. We allude to the teaching of the German language in the public schools.

THE SCORE OF ECONOMY.

We believe the first attempt to strike the German language from the course of studies was made on the score of economy. As real estate owners and taxpayers contributing our quota to the school fund, from which the common schools are maintained, and believing that some consideration should be paid to the wishes and wants of those who support these institutions, we would crave your indulgence for a few moments while we call your attention to some important facts. It is conceded by the great majority of educators at the present time, and it has always been claimed by the best teachers of every age, that instruction in language develops the intellect, trains the reasoning faculties, strengthens the memory and exercises the judgment of the scholar. In past times, when education was the monopoly of the privileged few, the child, almost as soon as it could read in its own tongue, was taught the elements of Latin. In our own days it is generally admitted that modern languages are preferable as an object of study for the masses, especially on account of their great practical utility, because proficiency in them can be acquired in very much less time than it takes to learn the classics, and because, by skilful teaching, they may be made exceedingly useful as a means of mental training. In the best schools of Germany, Holland, Switzerland or other countries of Europe, some modern language besides the vernacular is a regular branch of study. This is true, not of the higher institutions of learning only, but of the elementary schools corresponding to our grammar schools. Indeed, in many of the small towns and villages of Germany, in places, some of them numbering not more than 1,000 souls, English or French is taught as a regular study; and shall it be said that this great metropolis of the proudest Republic on which the sun ever shone, in the centennial year of its existence, is willing to do less for the instruction of its citizens, less for the training of its youth than the monarchies of the Old World are doing for their subjects?

IS ONE LANGUAGE ENOUGH?

Shall it be true that while England, France and other countries in which the education of the masses has until recently been more or less neglected are doing all they can to improve the mental condition of their population, New York, the most cosmopolitan city on the globe, is ready to take a step backward, ready to listen to the voice of prejudice and national hatred and curtail the few half hours' instruction, which will lay the foundation for the knowledge of a language which must be a source of future profit and delight, and which no one can deny is only the second in importance in our city and country to the English?

To go nearer home we would remind your honorable body that German is a regular branch of study in most of the great Western cities—in St. Louis, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Milwaukee, Columbus and many others—and that it is the unanimous opinion of the authorities in those places that the study of the German language far from retarding the progress of the scholars in their English studies, has enabled them to make the more progress. Shall New York, which is rapidly attaining the lead as the great literary centre of our Union, see itself outstripped in the educational advantages it offers its children by second rate Western cities, some of which were mere villages only a few decades ago?

SPOKEN BY A GREATER NUMBER.

We believe, if any one foreign language is to be made a regular branch of study, that German has superior claims to any other, both for the reason that it is spoken by a greater number of persons in New York and in the United States than any other, with the exception of the English naturally, and because of its great similarity to the latter, which in its grammatical forms and in the etymology of those words which are most frequently used in the intercourse of daily life is eminently a Germanic tongue, and is so classified by philologists.

But far be it from us to claim that German should be introduced as a regular branch of study into every grammar school throughout the city. If there be any schools in which the majority of the parents who send their children to them do not desire that their offspring should be taught an additional language we would b the last to attempt to force it upon them.

But in that section of the city in which we live the vast majority of the pupils in nearly all the schools are the children of parents who speak English imperfectly, who have come hither from the country of their birth more or less advanced in years, and who find it impossible ever to acquire such a fluent knowledge as to enable them to express their thoughts and feelings in that language with the same degree of skill as in the tongue which they learned at their mother's knee. These parents have come to America to stay, and the great majority of them are American citizens, and they have for years and will continue to contribute their share toward the maintenance of the government, its institutions, its laws and its schools. We need not remind your honorable body that, as a class, they are all orderly, industrious, law abiding; they are all, without exception, anxious that their children should receive a good education, and we believe that it will be found on inquiry that they are excelled by no class of the population in the support which they give to the teachers of their children.

SMALL NUMBER OF GERMAN TRUANTS.

We respectfully refer to the report of the Superintendent of Truancy, which shows how small is the percentage of the truant children of German-American parents when compared with the ratio which the German-American population of this city bears to the entire population, which cannot be far from thirty per cent. Very many of this part of our population were formerly in the habit of sending their children for two, three or four years during the whole term of their school life to German-American private schools and to the parochial schools connected with German churches. Most of them did this, not because they preferred these institutions to the public schools, but because they did not wish to have their children grow up estranged from their parents. At great sacrifice many a poor mechanic and laborer has sent his sons and daughters, for a while at least, to some private school solely that his children might learn with some degree of proficiency to read and to write that idiom in which they first lisped their infantile desires. Is there any member in your honorable body who could find fault with such parents as these?

They do not expect to have their children become proficient in German at the expense of the English. It is their most ardent wish that their sons and daughters should become thoroughly versed in that language which is and ever will be the language of this country. When those children who have been pupils of German-American private schools attend the public schools it is not to be wondered at if they seem behind those who never attended any other in their pronunciation of English and in their ability to clothe their thoughts in an English dress.

A FOREIGN ACCENT NOT DESIRABLE.

Some of these children, though to the manor born, never lose the slight foreign accent which they have acquired in the private schools, and the spectacle is thus presented of native born American citizens who yet speak the English language with more or less of a foreign accent. It is to avoid this, to give us a chance thoroughly to Americanize our children, that we desire to have some attention paid to the wishes of the parents who are compelled to converse with their children in the German language. We ask this not as aliens, not as foreigners, with a hankering after the institutions and language of the land of our birth; we ask it as American citizens, as taxpayers of New York, and we sincerely believe your honorable body will see the justice of our request. In most of the schools of the wards which we have the honor to represent the proportion of children whose parents speak to them in German is from seventy-five to ninety per cent. Whenever it is shown that there is an equal proportion of pupils attending any schools whose parents speak French or any other language and who desire to have their children receive instruction in that tongue we shall equally be ready to second their request. We are actuated by no motives arising from national prejudices; we feel and think as citizens of our glorious Republic and take equal pride with any in its welfare and prosperity. We simply ask your honorable Board for justice.

IS IT SO?

It has been asserted that a large majority of the inhabitants of New York object to having instruction in any other language besides English imparted in the common schools. We must beg leave to call in question the correctness of this statement. True, if it were represented that German has to be taught to the exclusion of English; if the impression was made to go abroad that the latter language is being seriously neglected in consequence of the excessive time devoted to the former we do not doubt for a moment that a vast majority, not only of the entire population but even of those American citizens who use the German language in their households, would declare against such a state of things. And we do further most truly believe that if it were properly presented to the people of New York city what those who desire to have German taught in our schools really wish, an equally large majority, not of the German speaking population alone, but of those whose mother tongue is English would be found ready to declare in its favor.

We have yet to learn that there is any considerable portion of the citizens of New York who regard the knowledge of another tongue beside the English as an injurious acquisition, or that time spent in learning it has been thrown away.

MINORITY REPRESENTATION.

In conclusion we respectfully suggest to your honorable Board that if in your judgment it be not wise to have the German language placed as a regular branch

[CONTINUED ON NINTH PAGE.]